

Diffuse high energy neutrinos and cosmic rays from hyperflares of soft-gamma repeaters

Xue-Wen Liu^{a,b,c}, Xue-Feng Wu^{a,c,d}, Tan Lu^{a,c}

^a*Purple Mountain Observatory, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Nanjing, 210008, China*

^b*Graduate School, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100039, China*

^c*Joint Center for Particle Nuclear Physics and Cosmology (J-CPNPC), Nanjing 210093, China*

^d*Department of Astronomy & Astrophysics, 525 Davey Lab, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA*

Abstract

We calculate the diffuse high energy (TeV - PeV) neutrino emission from hyperflares of Soft-Gamma Repeaters (SGRs), like the hyperflare risen from SGR 1806-20 on December 27 of 2004, within the framework of the fireball model. The fireball model for gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) can explain well the main features of this hyperflare and the subsequent multi-frequency afterglow emission. The expected rate, $\sim 20 - 100 \text{ Gpc}^{-3}\text{day}^{-1}$, of such hyperflares is well in excess of the GRBs rate. Our result shows that the contribution to the diffuse TeV-PeV neutrino background from such hyperflares is less than 10% of the contribution from GRBs. We also discuss the high energy cosmic rays (CRs) from these sources.

Key words: acceleration of particles — elementary particles — hydrodynamics — stars: neutron — stars: winds, outflows — gamma-rays: bursts

1 Introduction

It is a general consensus that relativistic shocks can accelerate nuclei to very high energies through the Fermi acceleration mechanism. By interacting with photons or baryons, such high energy nuclei (mostly protons) can generate

Email addresses: xwliu@pmo.ac.cn (Xue-Wen Liu), xfwu@pmo.ac.cn (Xue-Feng Wu), t.lu@pmo.ac.cn (Tan Lu).

pions and the latter cascade into neutrinos and leptons. So, for a relativistic jet that sweeps up its surrounding medium, it could be an efficient high-energy neutrino producer, if the jet is also surrounded by intense photon fields. Three famous kinds of such astronomical objects are gamma-ray bursts (GRBs; Waxman 1995; Vietri 1995; Waxman & Bahcall 1997; Bahcall & Mészáros 2000; Mészáros & Waxman 2001; Guetta, Spada & Waxman 2001; Dermer & Atoyan 2003; Asano & Mészáros 2008), active galactic nuclei (Axford 1994; Atoyan & Dermer 2001; Dermer, Ramirez-Ruiz & Le 2007; Berezhko 2008; Abbasi et al. 2008), and micro-quasars (Levinson & Waxman 2001; Distefano et al. 2002), all of which are usually discussed as high-energy neutrino and cosmic ray (CR) sources. For some thorough reviews on astrophysical neutrinos and their connection to CRs, we would like to refer the readers to the references Halzen et al. (2002) and Becker (2008). In this paper, we would focus on another kind of such astronomical objects, i.e., soft-gamma repeaters (SGRs) which are widely accepted as magnetars (pulsars with super strong magnetic field $\sim 10^{15}$ G; Duncan & Thompson 1992). Zhang et al. (2003) proposed a model for neutrino production by magnetars in their steady phase of periodic emission. In contrast, some short neutrino bursts could also be produced by a relativistic outflow during the violent giant-flare phase of SGRs.

Giant flares are distinguished from common SGR bursts by their extreme energies ($\sim 10^{44}$ ergs) emitted during their initial short (~ 0.1 s – 0.5 s) pulses of soft gamma rays followed by subsequent emission lasting hundreds of seconds showing pulsations associated with the spinning neutron star (Woods & Thompson 2006). Among the observed three giant flares during the last four decades, the brightest one originated from the SGR1806-20 on 2004 December 27 (Hurley et al. 2005; Palmer et al. 2005; Terasawa et al. 2005; Mazets et al. 2005) has an energy release exceeding 10^{46} ergs, which is two orders of magnitude higher than the energy release of the other two. The huge difference in the luminosity urges us to consider this kind of events separately and name it "hyperflare" (Popov & Stern 2006). The mechanism triggering hyperflares remains a matter of debate. Lugones (2007) proposed a model in which the core conversion of an isolated neutron star with a magnetic field of $\sim 10^{12}$ G and a fallback disk around it can trigger a giant flare. In the popular magnetar model, giant flares result from a global magnetic rearrangement within the crust of the magnetar (Thompson & Duncan 2001). Since giant flares have many similarities to GRBs which can be well understood by the fireball model (Piran 1998; Mészáros 2002), different scenarios have been proposed within the frame work of the fireball model (Wang et al. 2005; Dai et al. 2005; Yamazaki et al. 2005), to explain the abundant multi-frequency afterglow data of this hyperflare (Gaensler et al. 2005; Cameron et al. 2005; Taylor et al. 2005) and the flare itself might be the emission from the internal shock and/or the photosphere of the fireball if the relativistic outflow is variable (Nakar, Piran & Sari 2005; Ioka et al. 2005). Ioka et al. (2005) estimated the number of high-energy neutrino events from this hyperflare and argued that the neutrino flux should

be detected by current neutrino observatories such as AMANDA (Ahrens et al. 2002; Halzen, Landsman & Montaruli 2005), which may put constraints on the flare mechanism. Fan, Zhang & Wei (2005) considered the production of neutrinos with typical energy of 10^{14} eV through photomeson interaction of X-ray tail photons with $\sim 10^{17}$ eV CRs accelerated in the external forward shock by this hyperflare. They found that the neutrino fluence produced in the external shock is too weak to be detected.

The rate of hyperflares is very uncertain because of low statistics based on a small sample. Their intrinsic low release energies relative to GRBs make them impossible to be detected beyond $\sim 30 - 40$ Mpc by BATSE and ~ 70 Mpc by Swift (Hurley et al. 2005). Lazzati et al. (2005) gave a slightly less stringent limit for the rate of hyperflares: $< 1/130 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ per a Milky-Way-like galaxy. Popov & Stern (2006) argued that the rate is $\sim 10^{-3} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. They further conservatively estimated the expected rate of hyperflares to be $\sim 20 - 100 \text{ Gpc}^{-3} \text{ day}^{-1}$ (Popov & Postnov 2007). Recently, Lorimer et al. (2007) reported a discovery of a strong millisecond extragalactic radio burst with peculiar properties and estimated that the cosmological rate for this radio burst is $\sim 50 \text{ Gpc}^{-3} \text{ day}^{-1}$ which is in correspondence with the statistically estimated rate of hyperflares. Meanwhile, the millisecond time scale of the radio burst is consistent with an event in the magnetosphere of a magnetar, indicating that both the millisecond extragalactic radio burst and hyperflares may possibly come from the same source: magnetars (Popov & Postnov 2007).

The above rate of hyperflares in the universe is well in excess of the GRBs rate, while the total energy release of a hyperflare is much lower than that of a typical GRB. Based on the estimated rate and the fireball model proposed by Ioka et al. (2005) for the hyperflare of SGR 1806-20 (see Section 2) in which relativistic protons are accelerated by an internal shock and target photons are dominated by the hyperflare, we describe the neutrino production process within hyperflares in Section 3. We estimate the diffuse TeV-PeV neutrino flux from hyperflares, compare our results with that from magnetar steady phase and from GRBs in Section 4. We also give a discussion on high-energy CRs from hyperflares in this section. We summarize our results and conclusions in Section 5.

2 The fireball model for the hyperflare from SGR 1806-20

The hyperflare of SGR 1806-20 is the only event up to now and its spectrum may be either thermal (Hurley et al. 2005) or non-thermal (Mazets et al. 2005; Palmer et al. 2005). The baryon load in the outflow is less constrained in contrast to GRBs, then the outflow produced the hyperflare may be either baryon-poor or baryon-rich (Ioka et al. 2005). Based on the fireball model, we

describe these two scenarios as follows.

The isotropic soft γ -ray energy of the December 27 event, $E_\gamma \sim 3 \times 10^{46} E_{\gamma,46.5}$ ergs, released within a time interval of $t_0 \sim 0.1 t_{0,-1}$ s from somewhere near the surface of the magnetar with radius of $r_0 \sim 10^6$ cm, could create an optically thick fireball with an initial temperature of

$$T_0 \sim \left(\frac{L_0}{4\pi r_0^2 c a} \right)^{1/4} \sim 300 L_{0,47.5}^{1/4} r_{0,6}^{-1/2} \text{ keV}, \quad (1)$$

where a is the radiation density constant, $L_0 \sim L_\gamma / \xi_\gamma \sim 3 \times 10^{47} L_{0,47.5}$ ergs s^{-1} and ξ_γ is the conversion efficiency of total energy into gamma-rays (Ioka et al. 2005). The subsequent fireball evolution depends on the dimensionless entropy $\eta = L_0 / \dot{M} c^2$ which has a critical value (Mészáros & Rees 2000)

$$\eta_* = \left(\frac{L_0 \sigma_T}{4\pi m_p c^3 r_0} \right)^{1/4} \sim 100 L_{0,47.5}^{1/4} r_{0,6}^{-1/4}. \quad (2)$$

If $\eta < \eta_*$, the fireball is baryon-rich, then the photosphere appears in the coasting phase and almost all the energy goes into the kinetic luminosity of the outflow, $L_{\text{kin}} \sim L_0$. While if $\eta > \eta_*$, the fireball is baryon-poor, the photosphere appears in the acceleration phase and then a small fraction of the energy goes into the kinetic luminosity of the outflow $L_{\text{kin}} \sim L_\gamma \times \eta_*/\eta$ (Ioka et al. 2005). The above two scenarios are both possible for the December 27 hyperflare. The particular parameters adopted for the two scenarios by Ioka et al. (2005) are listed below

Baryon Poor: $\eta \sim 10^4$, $L_{\text{kin}} \sim 10^{-2} L_\gamma \sim 10^{45.5}$ ergs s^{-1} , $\Gamma \sim 100$, $\Delta t \sim 10^{-4}$ s,

Baryon Rich: $\eta \sim 10$, $L_{\text{kin}} \sim 10 L_\gamma \sim 10^{48.5}$ ergs s^{-1} , $\Gamma \sim 10$, $\Delta t \sim 10^{-1}$ s.

where Γ is the Lorentz factor of the outflow and Δt is the variability timescale of the hyperflare. It should be noted that the photosphere emission is thermal. If the internal shocks occur above the photosphere as in the baryon-rich model, the non-thermal shock emission will dominate the photosphere thermal emission if $\eta < 100 \eta_{*,2} \xi_s^{3/8}$, where ξ_s is the conversion efficiency of kinetic energy into photons (Ioka et al. 2005).

3 The neutrino production in hyperflares

The photon distribution in the comoving frame of the internal shocked region is usually assumed to be isotropic and described by monoenergetic number

density $dn_\gamma/d\epsilon_\gamma$ at energy ϵ_γ . The protons are usually assumed to be accelerated to a power law distribution by internal shocks, $dn_p/d\epsilon_p \propto \epsilon_p^{-2}$ where the proportional coefficient $1/\ln(\epsilon_{p,\max}/\epsilon_{p,\min})$ as the fraction of the total energy that is contributed by each decade of energy is about 0.1. When bathed in the hyperflare photon field, the high-energy protons would lose their energy by $p\gamma$ interaction, resulting in plenty of pions. Due to the pion production, the fractional energy loss rate of a proton with energy $\epsilon_p = \gamma_p m_p c^2$ is (Stecker 1968; Waxman & Bahcall 1997)

$$t_{p\gamma}^{-1} = -\frac{1}{\epsilon_p} \frac{d\epsilon_p}{dt} = \frac{c}{2\gamma_p^2} \int_{\bar{\epsilon}_{\gamma,\text{th}}}^{\infty} d\bar{\epsilon}_\gamma \bar{\sigma}_{p\gamma}(\bar{\epsilon}_\gamma) \bar{\kappa}_{p\gamma}(\bar{\epsilon}_\gamma) \bar{\epsilon}_\gamma \int_{\bar{\epsilon}_\gamma/2\gamma_p}^{\infty} d\epsilon_\gamma \epsilon_\gamma^{-2} \frac{dn_\gamma}{d\epsilon_\gamma} \quad (3)$$

where $\bar{\sigma}_{p\gamma}(\bar{\epsilon}_\gamma)$ is the cross section of the photopion interaction for a target photon with energy $\bar{\epsilon}_\gamma$ in the proton rest frame, $\bar{\kappa}_{p\gamma}$ is the inelasticity coefficient defined as the average fraction of energy lost to the pion and $\bar{\epsilon}_{\gamma,\text{th}} = 0.15$ GeV is the threshold energy. Using the Δ -resonance approximation, Eq. (3) can be casted into

$$t_{p\gamma}^{-1} \approx \frac{c\bar{\sigma}_{\text{peak}}\bar{\kappa}_{\text{peak}}\bar{\epsilon}_\Delta\overline{\Delta\epsilon}}{2\gamma_p^2} \int_{\bar{\epsilon}_\Delta/2\gamma_p}^{\infty} d\epsilon_\gamma \epsilon_\gamma^{-2} \frac{dn_\gamma}{d\epsilon_\gamma} \quad (4)$$

where $\bar{\sigma}_{\text{peak}} \simeq 5 \times 10^{-28}$ cm² and $\bar{\kappa}_{\text{peak}} \simeq 0.2$ are the values of $\bar{\sigma}$ and $\bar{\kappa}$ at $\bar{\epsilon}_\gamma = \bar{\epsilon}_\Delta = 0.3$ GeV where the cross section peaks due to the Δ resonance, and $\overline{\Delta\epsilon} \simeq 0.2$ GeV is the peak width.

Under the Δ -resonance approximation, the neutrino spectrum is totally determined by the parameter $f_{p\gamma} \simeq r_{\text{sh}}/\Gamma c t_{p\gamma}$, the fraction of energy lost by protons to pions, where the internal shock radius r_{sh} is $\sim 2\Gamma^2 c \Delta t$. At each $p\gamma$ interaction, a proton loses $\sim 20\%$ of its energy which is distributed roughly equally among the products of the decay processes $\pi^\pm \rightarrow \mu^\pm + \nu_\mu(\bar{\nu}_\mu) \rightarrow e^\pm + \nu_e(\bar{\nu}_e) + \nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu$. In addition the neutrino oscillation will change neutrino flavor from $\nu_e : \nu_\mu : \nu_\tau = 1 : 2 : 0$ at the source site to $1 : 1 : 1$ at the earth, which will reduce the observed muon neutrino flux by a factor of 2. Once we know the spectrum of the target photon, we can calculate the monoenergetic muon neutrino flux as

$$\Phi_{\nu,p\gamma} = \min(1, f_{p\gamma}) \frac{1}{8} \frac{\xi_i L_{\text{kin}}}{4\pi d^2 \epsilon_{\nu,\text{typ}}^2}, \quad (5)$$

where d is the luminosity distance of the source, ξ_i is the fraction of the total kinetic energy converted into accelerated protons and $\epsilon_{\nu,\text{typ}}$ is the typical energy of neutrinos produced by the $p\gamma$ interactions. Below we consider two different types of photon spectra of SGR hyperflares.

3.1 The thermal spectrum of hyperflares

Hurley et al. (2005) reported that the observed energy spectrum of the hard spike of the December 27 hyperflare is consistent with a cooling blackbody with average temperature $k_B T_{\text{obs}} = 175 \pm 25$ keV, and thus the photon peak energy in the observer frame is $\epsilon_{\gamma, \text{peak}}^{\text{obs}} \approx 2.7 k_B T_{\text{obs}}$. The differential photon field density in the comoving frame of the internal shocked region is therefore $dn_\gamma/d\epsilon_\gamma = (8\pi/h^3 c^3)(\epsilon_\gamma^2/(e^{\epsilon_\gamma/k_B T} - 1))$, where $T = T_{\text{obs}}/\Gamma$ and $\epsilon_\gamma = \epsilon_\gamma^{\text{obs}}/\Gamma$. From $n_\gamma = \int_0^\infty \frac{dn_\gamma}{d\epsilon_\gamma} d\epsilon_\gamma \simeq L_\gamma/(4\pi r^2 c \Gamma \epsilon_{\gamma, \text{peak}}^{\text{obs}})$, we have (Ioka et al. 2005)

$$n_\gamma \sim \begin{cases} 7 \times 10^{18} L_{\gamma, 47.5} \epsilon_{\gamma, 5.3}^{-1} \Gamma_2^{-5} \Delta t_{-4}^{-2} \text{ cm}^{-3} & (\text{Baryon Poor}) \\ 7 \times 10^{17} L_{\gamma, 47.5} \epsilon_{\gamma, 5.3}^{-1} \Gamma_1^{-5} \Delta t_{-1}^{-2} \text{ cm}^{-3} & (\text{Baryon Rich}) \end{cases}, \quad (6)$$

where $\epsilon_{\gamma, 5.3} = \epsilon_{\gamma, \text{peak}}^{\text{obs}}/200$ keV.

Inserting the differential photon number density into Eq. (4), we obtain the analytical form of the fractional energy loss rate as

$$t_{p\gamma}^{-1} \approx \frac{U_\gamma c}{\epsilon_{\gamma, \text{peak}}} \bar{\sigma}_{\text{peak}} \bar{\kappa}_{\text{peak}} \frac{\bar{\Delta\epsilon}}{\bar{\epsilon}_\Delta} \times x^2 |\ln(1 - e^{-x})|, \quad (7)$$

where the dimensionless parameter $x = \bar{\epsilon}_\Delta/(2\gamma_p k_B T)$ and the photon energy density $U_\gamma = n_\gamma \epsilon_{\gamma, \text{peak}} = L_\gamma/(4\pi r^2 c \Gamma^2)$. Then $f_{p\gamma}$ can be derived analytically,

$$f_{p\gamma, \text{th}} \simeq x^2 |\ln(1 - e^{-x})| \times \begin{cases} 0.28 L_{\gamma, 47.5} \epsilon_{\gamma, 5.3}^{-1} \Gamma_2^{-4} \Delta t_{-4}^{-1} & (\text{Baryon Poor}) \\ 2.8 L_{\gamma, 47.5} \epsilon_{\gamma, 5.3}^{-1} \Gamma_1^{-4} \Delta t_{-1}^{-1} & (\text{Baryon Rich}) \end{cases}, \quad (8)$$

which peaks at $x_{\text{peak}} = 2.7 \bar{\kappa} \Gamma^2 \bar{\epsilon}_\Delta m_p c^2 / (8 \epsilon_\nu^{\text{obs}} \epsilon_{\gamma, \text{peak}}^{\text{obs}}) \approx 1.8$. Approximation of the scaling function $|\ln(1 - e^{-x})|$ yields e^{-x} for $x > x_{\text{peak}}$, and $|\ln x|$ for $x \ll 1$. Thus, the exponential suppression of the neutrino spectrum appears for $\epsilon_\nu^{\text{obs}} < 3 \bar{\kappa} \Gamma^2 \bar{\epsilon}_\Delta m_p c^2 / (16 \epsilon_{\gamma, \text{peak}}^{\text{obs}})$, and high energy region of neutrinos scales as $x^2 |\ln x|$. Meanwhile, we get the peak energy of the neutrino spectrum

$$\epsilon_{\nu, \text{peak}}^{\text{obs}} = \frac{3 \bar{\kappa} \Gamma^2 \bar{\epsilon}_\Delta m_p c^2}{16 \epsilon_{\gamma, \text{peak}}^{\text{obs}}} \sim \begin{cases} 560 \Gamma_2^2 \epsilon_{\gamma, 5.3}^{-1} \text{ TeV}, & (\text{Baryon Poor}) \\ 5.6 \Gamma_1^2 \epsilon_{\gamma, 5.3}^{-1} \text{ TeV}, & (\text{Baryon Rich}) \end{cases}. \quad (9)$$

3.2 The non-thermal spectrum of hyperflares

The photon spectrum of the 2004 December 27 hyperflare is also likely to be non-thermal, making this event resemble a short, hard gamma-ray burst (SHB). Palmer et al. (2005) argued that such an energetic SGR flare may indeed form a subclass of GRBs. With a luminosity of $\sim 10^{47}$ ergs s $^{-1}$, such flares can be detected by BATSE up to ≈ 40 Mpc, suggesting that a considerable fraction of the BATSE SHB sample is compromised of similar extragalactic hyperflares (Palmer et al. 2005; Hurley et al. 2005; Popov & Stern 2006; Nakar 2007). Another two short hard GRBs, 051103 and 070201, are recently reported to show evidences as hyperflares from SGRs in the nearby M81 and M31 galaxies, respectively (Frederiks et al. 2007; Mazets et al. 2008). So although very uncertain, at least part of hyperflares from SGRs would have a similar spectrum to SHBs. Since the non-thermal component is negligible in the baryon-poor model, we only consider a typical non-thermal hyperflare spectrum in the baryon-rich scenario with a break energy $\epsilon_{\gamma,b}^{\text{obs}} \sim 200$ keV

$$\frac{dn_{\gamma}}{d\epsilon_{\gamma}} = n_b \times \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\epsilon_{\gamma}}{\epsilon_{\gamma,b}}\right)^{-\alpha}, & \epsilon_{\gamma} < \epsilon_{\gamma,b} \\ \left(\frac{\epsilon_{\gamma}}{\epsilon_{\gamma,b}}\right)^{-\beta}, & \epsilon_{\gamma} > \epsilon_{\gamma,b} \end{cases}, \quad (10)$$

where $\epsilon_{\gamma,b} = \epsilon_{\gamma,b}^{\text{obs}}/\Gamma$ and $n_b \sim U_{\gamma}/2\epsilon_{\gamma,b}^2$. After performing the integration in Eq. (4), we can approximate the energy loss rate of protons by (Waxman & Bahcall 1997; Murase & Nagataki 2006)

$$t_{p\gamma}^{-1} = \frac{U_{\gamma}c}{2\epsilon_{\gamma,b}} \bar{\sigma}_{\text{peak}} \bar{\kappa}_{\text{peak}} \frac{\bar{\Delta}\epsilon}{\bar{\epsilon}_{\Delta}} \times \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\bar{\epsilon}_{\Delta}}{2\gamma_p\epsilon_{\gamma,b}}\right)^{1-\alpha}, & \epsilon_{\gamma} < \epsilon_{\gamma,b} \\ \left(\frac{\bar{\epsilon}_{\Delta}}{2\gamma_p\epsilon_{\gamma,b}}\right)^{1-\beta}, & \epsilon_{\gamma} > \epsilon_{\gamma,b} \end{cases}, \quad (11)$$

and thus

$$f_{p\gamma,\text{non-th}} \simeq 1.4 L_{\gamma,47.5} \epsilon_{\gamma,5.3}^{-1} \Gamma_1^{-4} \Delta t_{-1}^{-1} \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\epsilon_{\nu}^{\text{obs}}}{\epsilon_{\nu,b}^{\text{obs}}}\right)^{\beta-1}, & \epsilon_{\nu}^{\text{obs}} < \epsilon_{\nu,b}^{\text{obs}} \\ \left(\frac{\epsilon_{\nu}^{\text{obs}}}{\epsilon_{\nu,b}^{\text{obs}}}\right)^{\alpha-1}, & \epsilon_{\nu}^{\text{obs}} > \epsilon_{\nu,b}^{\text{obs}} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where $\epsilon_{\nu,b}^{\text{obs}} \approx \bar{\kappa}\Gamma^2\bar{\epsilon}_{\Delta}m_pc^2/(8\epsilon_{\gamma,b}^{\text{obs}}) \approx 4\Gamma_1^2$ TeV is the neutrino break energy in the observer frame. The power law neutrino spectrum resulting from a non-thermal target photon field is quite different to the one predicted from a thermal photon field as in Eq. (8).

4 The diffuse high-energy neutrinos and CRs from hyperflares

Similar to GRBs, a high-energy neutrino flash accompanying an SGR hyperflare would be expected if the source is nearby and energetic. Below we discuss the probability of detecting TeV-EeV muon neutrinos from the SGR 1806-20 hyperflare by IceCube, using the following formula (Razzaque et al. 2004; Ioka et al. 2005)

$$P(\epsilon_\nu) = 7 \times 10^{-5} (\epsilon_\nu / 10^{4.5} \text{ GeV})^\beta, \quad (13)$$

where $\beta = 1.35$ for $\epsilon_\nu < 10^{4.5} \text{ GeV}$ while $\beta = 0.55$ for $\epsilon_\nu > 10^{4.5} \text{ GeV}$. The number of muon events from muon neutrinos above TeV is given by

$$N_\mu = A_{\text{det}} t_0 \int_{\text{TeV}}^{\text{PeV}} P(\epsilon_\nu) \Phi_{\nu, p\gamma} d\epsilon_\nu, \quad (14)$$

where the geometrical detector area of IceCube $A_{\text{det}} \sim 1 \text{ km}^2$ ($A_{\text{det}} \sim 0.03 \text{ km}^2$ for AMANDA). Then the number of muon events from $p\gamma$ neutrinos at typical energy ($\epsilon_{\nu, \text{typ}} = \epsilon_{\nu, \text{peak}}^{\text{obs}}$ for thermal spectrum and $\epsilon_{\nu, \text{typ}} = \epsilon_{\nu, b}^{\text{obs}}$ for non-thermal spectrum) is

$$N_\mu = A_{\text{det}} t_0 P(\epsilon_{\nu, \text{typ}}) \epsilon_{\nu, \text{typ}} \Phi_{\nu, p\gamma} \sim \begin{cases} 1.3 \min(1, f_{p\gamma, \text{th}}) \xi_{i, -1} L_{\text{kin}, 45.5} d_1^{-2} (\epsilon_{\gamma, 5.3} \Gamma_2^2)^{\beta-1} A_{\text{det}, 1} t_{0, -1} & \text{(Baryon Poor)} \\ 2500 \min(1, f_{p\gamma, \text{th}}) \xi_{i, -1} L_{\text{kin}, 48.5} d_1^{-2} (\epsilon_{\gamma, 5.3} \Gamma_1^2)^{\beta-1} A_{\text{det}, 1} t_{0, -1} & \text{(Baryon Rich)} \\ 2200 \min(1, f_{p\gamma, \text{non-th}}) \xi_{i, -1} L_{\text{kin}, 48.5} d_1^{-2} (\Gamma_1^2)^{\beta-1} A_{\text{det}, 1} t_{0, -1} & \text{(Baryon Rich)} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where the distance of SGR 1806-20 is taken to be $10d_1 \text{ kpc}$ (see Ioka et al. 2005; Dai et al. 2005; however $d \sim 15 \text{ kpc}$ in Corbel & Eikenberry 2004). Due to the model uncertainties, the number of muon events spans more than three orders of magnitude. To see clearly the behavior of the number of muon events depending on the model parameters, we can fix the values of ξ_i , d and set Δt free in the baryon-poor model, then the event number is approximately proportional to $\eta_*/\eta(\min[\eta, \eta_*])^{2\beta-2}$. Parameter space in the $\eta - \Delta t$ plot where IceCube can detect more than one muon event from SGR 1806-20 is shown in Fig. 1 of Ioka et al. (2005). It can be seen that a baryon-poor outflow with entropy less than 2500 can trigger one event. While if the outflow is baryon-rich, IceCube can detect about one event even when a hyperflare considered here is located $\sim 200 \text{ kpc}$ away. If such detection comes true, it will provide independent evidence for the picture in which relativistic outflows produce hyperflare electromagnetic emission and constrain the parameters of the baryon loading, the bulk Lorentz factor of the fireball, the efficiency of energy conversion and

the variability timescale of the hyperflare. It should be noted that we neglect the neutrino production through the pp reaction in this paper.

Now we turn to the observations. The AMANDA-II detector was running to search for down-going muons cascading into high-energy gamma-rays and neutrinos, when the hyperflare on December 27, 2004 saturated many satellite gamma-ray detectors. However, the data revealed no significant signal which put an upper limit on neutrino flux of the hyperflare: $\Phi_\nu < 0.4(6.1) \text{ TeV m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for an energy spectrum index $-1.47 (-2)$ (Achterberg et al. 2006). This limit would suggest a baryon-poor outflow, which means that the diffuse neutrino flux from the hyperflare is much lower than $1.0 \times 10^{-10} \text{ GeV cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, far below the IceCube sensitivity $\sim 8.0 \times 10^{-9} \text{ GeV cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ after one year (Ahrens et al. 2004; Hoshina et al. 2008; Halzen 2008). But IceCube, currently under construction at the South pole, can potentially detect TeV-PeV neutrinos from a single hyperflare originating from a baryon-poor outflow (see Eq. 15). Another detector Km3NeT, a planned experiment in the Mediterranean Sea to complement the IceCube, will have a better detectability for a south-hemisphere source like SGR 1806-20 due to its low background of atmospheric muons (Katz 2006). As estimated above, in the baryon-rich model, a hyperflare with the same energy as the hyperflare of SGR 1806-20 can be detected by IceCube within $\sim 200 \text{ kpc}$. If AMANDA-II really had not observed high energy neutrinos from SGR 1806-20, then IceCube can only detect hyperflares in our galaxy. SGR 1806-20 and SGR 1900+14 showing giant flares are associated with massive star clusters (Fuchs et al. 1999; Wachter et al. 2008), and SGR 0525-66 is associated with a supernova remnant (Gaensler et al. 2001; Eikenberry 2003). The best sites for IceCube to search for high energy neutrinos from SGRs are active star-formation regions in our galaxy, such as Westerlund 1, a young massive star cluster, in which several neutron stars and magnetars were discovered (Muno et al. 2006; Muno et al. 2007; Clark et al. 2008). For electromagnetic signals, the detection distance can be as far as $\sim 70 \text{ Mpc}$ by the Swift's Burst Alert Telescope (BAT), which gives an excellent opportunity to observe extragalactic giant flares and hyperflares from SGRs (Hurley 2005). Popov & Stern (2006) proposed the most promising targets for such observations, e.g., Virgo Cluster, NGC3256 etc. Although as a smaller detector, the Fermi's Gamma-Ray Burst Monitor (GBM) is less sensitive than BATSE and thus its detection distance for hyperflares is $\leq 40 \text{ Mpc}$, can augment the Swift's high energy sensitivity. Via the Fermi's Large Area Telescope (LAT), the detection can be naturally extended to the GeV region (Gehrels et al. 2007). The broad-band studies will enable the investigation of the hyperflare spectral and temporal evolution over 7 orders of magnitude in wavelength, shedding light on the mechanism of hyperflares. The gamma-rays decayed from the neutral pions produced by hadronic interactions have a flux and energy comparable to neutrinos. These TeV-PeV gamma-rays might be detected by the southern Cherenkov telescope, e.g., H.E.S.S., if the gamma-rays can escape the pair production absorption (Kohnle et al. 2000).

Besides possible detection of neutrinos from a single hyperflare, the contribution to the neutrino background from such hyperflares is also expected to be important since the hyperflare explosion rate is high. The total energy spectrum of the accelerated protons can be written as

$$\epsilon_p^2 \frac{dn_p}{d\epsilon_p} \simeq \frac{\xi_i L_{\text{kin}} t_0}{\ln(\epsilon_{p,\text{max}}/\epsilon_{p,\text{min}})}. \quad (16)$$

Then we can estimate the diffuse neutrino background flux from hyperflares based on the template of the SGR 1806-20 hyperflare by

$$\begin{aligned} e_\nu^2 \phi_\nu &\sim \frac{c}{4\pi H_0} \frac{1}{8} \min(1, f_{p\gamma}) \epsilon_p^2 \frac{dn_p}{d\epsilon_p} R_{\text{HF}}(0) f_z f_b \\ &\simeq \min(1, f_{p\gamma}) \left(\frac{R_{\text{HF}}(0)}{90 \times 365 \text{ GeV}^{-3} \text{ yr}^{-1}} \right) \left(\frac{f_z}{3} \right) \left(\frac{f_b}{0.1} \right) \\ &\quad \times \begin{cases} 0.86 \times 10^{-14} \xi_{i,-0.5} L_{\text{kin},45.5} t_{0,-1} & (\text{BaryonPoor}) \\ 0.86 \times 10^{-11} \xi_{i,-0.5} L_{\text{kin},48.5} t_{0,-1} & (\text{BaryonRich}) \end{cases} \\ &\quad \text{GeV cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ str}^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $H_0 = 71 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, f_b is the beaming factor, $R_{\text{HF}}(0)$ is the total hyperflare rate at $z = 0$, and f_z is the correction factor for the possible contribution from high redshift sources. Although we can always choose Δt to set that $\min(1, f_{p\gamma}) = 1$, the diffuse TeV-PeV neutrino flux, however, also depends on the baryon loading of the outflow, the explosion rate, the efficiency of energy conversion and the geometry-corrected energy of the hyperflare, and therefore it is more uncertain than the high energy neutrino flux from a single source. Among these four parameters, the efficiency ξ_i is more stringently constrained because it is less dependent on the model of hyperflares, the other three parameters have large uncertainties due to low statistics with using only one sample. In addition to strong hyperflares, SGRs also show less intensive but more frequent giant flares, e.g., the giant flares of March 5, 1979 from SGR 0525-66 with an isotropic energy $E_{\text{iso}} = 3.6 \times 10^{44} \text{ ergs}$, and Aug 27, 1998 from SGR 1900+14 with $E_{\text{iso}} = 5.2 \times 10^{43} \text{ ergs}$. Their galactic rate is estimated to be about $0.05 - 0.02 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Woods & Thompson 2006), one order larger than that of hyperflares. The less energetic giant flare may have a larger beaming factor than typical hyperflares, thus the giant flares and hyperflares would possibly provide the same contributions to the diffuse neutrino background. Due to the low statistics, it is unknown whether giant flares and hyperflares from SGRs form a continuous luminosity distribution. We cannot estimate the contribution of high energy neutrinos from hyperflares with energy larger than the December 27, 2004 event. Nevertheless, the baryon-rich model with high explosion rate and large geometry-corrected energy predicts high diffuse neutrino flux. To be specific, we estimate a TeV-PeV diffuse neu-

trino flux of 4×10^{-11} GeV cm $^{-2}$ s $^{-1}$ str $^{-1}$ by using an optimistic set of model parameters ($\eta = 10$, $\xi_i = 0.5$, $f_b = 0.25$, $L_{\gamma,47.5} = 1.0$, $t_0 = 0.1$ and $R_{\text{HF}} = 100$ Gpc $^{-3}$ day $^{-1}$). This value is about three orders of magnitude higher than that estimated in magnetar steady phase (Zhang et al. 2003), while more than one order of magnitude lower than that from high-luminosity GRBs and low-luminosity GRBs (LL-GRBs) (Waxman & Bahcall 1997; Murase & Nagataki 2006).

In addition to be served as high-energy neutrino factories, hyperflares are also possible sources of CRs (Asano et al. 2006). A baryon-rich outflow and a baryon-poor outflow can accelerate protons to the maximal energies of 7×10^{18} eV and 4×10^{16} eV, respectively (Ioka et al. 2005). Recently, Wang et al. (2007) and Budnik et al. (2008) argued that the trans-relativistic supernovae accompanied by LL-GRBs may be the mecca of CRs within the energy range $10^{17} - 10^{19}$ eV due to their energetic outflows and high explosion rate. Is it possible that hyperflare are important sources of CRs in this energy range? For a baryon-poor outflow, low magnetic field can not accelerate CRs to sufficient high energies and there is no adequate kinetic energy available for CRs. While for a baryon-rich outflow, the kinetic energy is $\sim 10^{47.5}$ ergs, four orders of magnitude lower than that of LL-GRBs. On the other hand, the explosion rate of hyperflares is two orders of magnitude higher than the latter. So even if hyperflare have a baryon-rich origin, their contribution to CRs within the energy range $10^{17} - 10^{19}$ eV is only $\sim 1\%$ of that of LL-GRBs.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we have calculated the diffuse TeV-PeV neutrino flux from hyperflares of SGRs based on the template of the famous 2004 December 27 event and the fireball model. Because of a possible high explosion rate, albeit very uncertain, hyperflares have a contribution, although likely less than 10% of the contribution from GRBs, to the diffuse high-energy neutrino background. However, the nondetection of the neutrinos from SGR 1806-20 by AMANDA II indicates that the hyperflare may have a baryon-poor origin and thus its contribution to neutrino background can be negligible. It is hard for IceCube to detect the diffuse high energy neutrinos from hyperflares, though which can put severe constraints on the hyperflare explosion rate. However the neutrino detectors of IceCube and Km3NeT can optimistically capture the TeV-PeV neutrinos from a single event like the hyperflare by SGR 1806-20, which may provide independent clues on the trigger mechanism of the hyperflare in addition to its electromagnetic emission. More observations are required to improve the statistics and verify what scenario is correct.

6 Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the anonymous referees' constructive comments and suggestions which improved our paper significantly. We thank Dr YWYu for improving the manuscript. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grants 10473023, 10503012, 10621303, and 10633040), the National Basic Research Program of China (973 Program 2009CB824800). XFW also thanks the supports of NSF AST 0307376, NASA NNX07AJ62G, NNX08AL40G, the Special Foundation for the Authors of National Excellent Doctorial Dissertations of P. R. China by Chinese Academy of Sciences, China Postdoctoral Science Foundation, and Postdoctoral Research Award of Jiangsu Province.

References

- Abbasi, R.U., et al., 2008. *Astropart.Phys* 30, 175.
Achterberg, A., 2006. *Phys.Rev.Lett* 97, 221101.
Ahrens, J., et al., 2002. *Phys.Rev.D* 66, 012005.
Ahrens, J., et al., 2004. *Astropart.Phys* 20, 507.
Asano, K., Yamazaki, R., Sugiyama, N., 2006. *PASJ* 58, L7.
Asano, K., Mészáros, P., 2008. *ApJ* 677, L31.
Atoyan, A., Dermer, C.D., 2001. *Phys.Rev.Lett* 87, 221102.
Axford, W.I., 1994. *ApJSS* 90, 937.
Bahcall, J.N., Mészáros, P., 2000. *Phys.Rev.Lett* 85, 1362.
Becker, J.K., 2008. *Phys.Rep* 458, 173.
Berezhko, E.G., 2008. *ApJ* 684, L69.
Budnik, R., Katz, B., MacFadyen, A., Waxman, E., 2008. *ApJ* 673, 928.
Cameron, P.B., et al., 2005. *Nature* 434, 1112.
Clark, J.S., et al., 2008. *A&A* 477, 147.
Corbel, S., Eikenberry, S.S., 2004. *A&A* 419, 191.
Dai, Z.G., Wu, X.F., Wang, X.Y., Huang, Y.F., Zhang, B., 2005. *ApJ* 629, L81.
Dermer, C.D., Atoyan, A., 2003. *Phys.Rev.Lett* 91, 071102.
Dermer, C.D., Ramirez-Ruiz, E., Le, T., 2007. *ApJ* 664, L67.
Distefano, C., Guetta, D., Waxman, E., Levinson, A., 2002. *ApJ* 575, 378.
Duncan, R.C., Thompson, C., 1992. *ApJ* 392, L9.
Eikenberry, S.S., 2003. *AIP Conf. Proc* 662, 574.
Fan, Y.Z., Zhang, B., Wei, D.M., 2005. *MNRAS* 361, 965.
Frederiks, D.D., et al., 2007. *Astronomy Letters* 33, 19.
Fuchs, Y., et al., 1999. *A&A* 350, 891.
Gaensler, B.M., et al., 2001. *ApJ* 559, 963.
Gaensler, B.M., et al., 2005. *Nature* 434, 1104.

- Gehrels, N., et al., 2007. *New Journal of Physics* 9, 37.
- Guetta, D., Spada, M., Waxman, E., 2001. *ApJ* 559, 101.
- Halzen, F., 2002. *Rept.Prog.Phys* 65, 1025.
- Halzen, F., Landsman, H., Montaruli, T., 2005. arXiv: astro-ph/0503348.
- Halzen, F., 2008. arXiv: astro-ph/0809.1874.
- Hoshina, K., et al., 2008. in *Proc. of 30th ICRC* 5, 1449
- Hurley, K., et al., 2005. *Nature* 434, 1098.
- Ioka, K., Razzaque, S., Kobayashi, S., Mészáros, P., 2005. *ApJ* 633, 1013.
- Katz, U.F., 2006. *Nucl.Instrum.Meth.A* 567, 457.
- Kohnle, A., et al., 2000. *Nucl.Instrum.Meth.A* 442, 322.
- Lazzati, D., Ghirlanda, G., Ghisellini, G., 2005. *MNRAS* 362, L8.
- Levinson, A., Waxman, E., 2001. *Phys.Rev.Lett* 87, 171101.
- Lorimer, D.R., Bailes, M., McLaughlin, M.A., Narkevic, D.J., Crawford, F., 2007. *Science* 318, 777.
- Lugones, G., 2007. arXiv: astro-ph/0710.3984.
- Mazets, E.P., et al., 2005. arXiv: astro-ph/0502541.
- Mazets, E.P., et al., 2008. *ApJ* 680, 545.
- Muno, M.P., et al., 2006. *ApJ* 636, L41.
- Muno, M.P., et al., 2007. *MNRAS* 378, L44.
- Mészáros, P., Rees, M.J., 2000. *ApJ* 530, 292.
- Mészáros, P., Waxman, E., 2001. *Phys.Rev.Lett* 87, 171102.
- Mészáros, P., 2002. *ARA&A* 40, 137.
- Murase, K., Nagataki, S., 2006. *Phys.Rev.Lett* 97, 051101.
- Nakar, E., Piran, T., Sari, R., 2005. *ApJ* 635, 516.
- Nakar, E., 2007. *Phys.Rep* 442, 166.
- Palmer, D.M., et al., 2005. *Nature* 434, 1107.
- Piran, T., 1998. *Phys.Rep* 314, 575.
- Popov, S.B., Stern, B.E., 2006. *MNRAS* 365, 885.
- Popov, S.B., Postnov, K.A., 2007. arXiv: astro-ph/0710.2006.
- Razzaque, S., Mészáros, P., Waxman, E., 2004. *Phys.Rev.D* 69, 023001.
- Stecker, F.W., 1968. *Phys.Rev.Lett* 21, 1016.
- Taylor, G.B., et al., 2005. *ApJ* 634, L93.
- Terasawa, T., et al., 2005. *Nature* 435, 1110.
- Thompson, C., Duncan, R.C., 2001. *ApJ* 561, 980.
- Vietri, M., 1995. *ApJ* 453, 883.
- Wachter, S., et al., 2008. *Nature* 453, 626.
- Wang, X.Y., Wu, X.F., Fan, Y.Z., Dai, Z.G., Zhang, B., 2005. *ApJ* 623, L29.
- Wang, X.Y., Razzaque, S., Mészáros, P., Dai, Z.G., 2007. *Phys.Rev.D* 76, 083009.
- Waxman, E., 1995. *Phys.Rev.Lett* 75, 386.
- Waxman, E., Bahcall, J.N., 1997. *Phys.Rev.Lett* 78, 2292.
- Woods, P.M., Thompson, C., 2006. In: "Compact stellar X-ray sources", Edited by Walter Lewin & Michiel van der Klis. Cambridge Astrophysics Series, No. 39, Cambridge University Press, p. 547.
- Yamazaki, R., Ioka, K., Takahara, F., Shibasaki, N., 2005. *PASJ* 57, L11.

Zhang, B., Dai, Z.G., Mészáros, P., Waxman, E., Harding, A.K., 2003. ApJ 595, 346.